DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 581 UD 009 528

AUTHOR VINCI, THOMAS G.
TITLE EDUCATIONAL FIELD TRIPS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS. EVALUATION OF ESEA TITLE I PROJECTS IN NEW YORK CITY 1968-69.
INSTITUTION CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y. EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE.
SPONS AGENCY NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION, BROOKLYN, N.Y.
REPORT NO ERC-E010E
PUB DATE OCT 69
NOTE 60P.

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.10
DESCRIPTORS ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES, CULTURAL ENRICHMENT, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *FIELD TRIPS, PARENT ATTITUDES, *PRIVATE SCHOOLS, QUESTIONNAIRES, STUDENT ATTITUDES, TEACHER ATTITUDES, URBAN SCHOOLS
IDENTIFIERS *ELEMENTARY SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT TITLE I PROGRAM, ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS, NEW YORK CITY

ABSTRACT

THIS REPORT DESCRIBES THE FINDINGS OF A STUDY OF AN EDUCATIONAL BUS TRIP PROGRAM FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN. THE PARTICIPANT SCHOOLS ARE LOCATED IN NEIGHBORHOODS CERTIFIED AS POVERTY AREAS BY THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL AGAINST POVERTY. DATA ANALYZED WERE GATHERED THROUGH QUESTIONNAIRES TO TEACHERS, PARENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND STUDENTS. RECOMMENDATIONS OFFERED AS MEANS OF STRENGTHENING THE PROGRAM WERE AS FOLLOWS. (1) TEACHERS SHOULD PROVIDE MORE STRUCTURE IN ADVANCE OF EACH TRIP SO THAT STUDENTS CAN FOCUS THEIR ATTENTION ON PARTICULAR ASPECTS OF THE TRIP BEING PLANNED. (2) TEACHERS SHOULD BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO VISIT THE TRIP SITES PRIOR TO SCHEDULED TRIPS SO THAT MORE EFFECTIVE ADVANCED PREPARATION OF THE PUPILS COULD RESULT. (3) GREATER EFFORT SHOULD BE MADE TO ENSURE THAT PARENT ESCORTS ACCOMPANY ALL TRIPS TO PROVIDE SUPERVISION FOR SMALLER TRIP SITE GROUPING, ESPECIALLY WHERE NO TOUR GUIDE IS AVAILABLE. COPIES OF QUESTIONNAIRE FORMS USED ARE APPENDED. SEE ED 034 002 FOR 1967-68 EVALUATION REPORT. (RJ)

ED036581

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

E010e

09528

Project No. 2969

EDUCATIONAL FIELD TRIPS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

by Thomas G. Vinci

October 1969

Evaluation of
ESEA Title I Projects
in New York City
1968-69

UD 009 528

The Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10016

ED036581

Center for Urban Education
Educational Research Committee
ESEA Title I Program Evaluation

EDUCATIONAL FIELD TRIPS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

Thomas G. Vinci

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1968-69 school year.

September 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Topic	Page
I	Project Description	1
II	Evaluation Design	2
III	The Findings	5
	A. Interviews with Children	5
	B. Questionnaires to Teachers in Charge	7
	C. Questionnaires to Principals	12
	D. Observations During the Bus Trips	16
	E. Parent Interviews	18
	F. Parent Questionnaires	19
	G. Pre-Trip Lessons	21
	H. Post-Trip Lessons	23
	I. Children's Retention	24
IV	Conclusions and Recommendations	26
	Appendix A: Tables (Included in Text)	
	Appendix B: Instruments	B1
	Appendix C: Staff List	C1

CHAPTER I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project, Educational Field Trips for Disadvantaged Pupils in Nonpublic Schools, is now in its third year of operation. In the current recycling, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I funds were provided for bus transportation for approximately 82,000 children to participate in educationally enriching field trips to places of civic and cultural interest within New York City. The project included children in grades one through eight in 176 nonpublic schools. This represents a decrease of six schools from the previous year.

Trips took place from October 1968 through June 1969. Most trips were scheduled during regular school time, and lasted approximately five hours. Some half-day trips were also taken. At times, Saturday and Sunday trips were provided; these ran from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Although some choice was given to the schools in selecting a trip destination, trips were permitted only to places considered to be of civic and cultural interest within the boundaries of the five boroughs of New York City. Each school had to make its own reservations and preparations for the trips, including the handling of parking charges, admission fees, and any other expenses incurred because of the trip. Bus transportation was furnished by the Board of Education of the City of New York.

CHAPTER II. THE EVALUATION DESIGN

The following goals were selected as evaluation objectives for the project:

1. To determine the extent to which field trips provide cultural and enrichment benefits for children in grades one through eight.

2. To determine the extent to which such experiences are organized in an efficient manner.

3. To determine the amount of communication between parents and children resulting from the cultural and enrichment experiences.

4. To determine the amount and type of classroom preparation and follow-up in the program.

5. To determine the holding effect and children's retention of trip experiences.

Attainment of the first program objective was ascertained by: the use of interviews with and questionnaires to teachers and school principals selected on a random sample basis; and interviews with randomly selected students at trip sites and in transit to and from trip destinations. The second goal, the extent to which enrichment experiences were effectively organized, was evaluated through: interviews with and questionnaires to teachers and school principals, selected on a random sample basis; and observation schedules completed by observers who accompanied selected trips. In order to determine the amount of parent-child communication resulting from the trip program, the third objective of the project, interviews were held with a sample of students two or more weeks after the trip. The fourth aspect of the program, the amount and

type of classroom preparation and follow-up, was determined by an analysis of descriptions of pre-trip and post-trip lessons completed by a sample of the teachers. The final evaluation goal, ascertaining the holding effect and children's retention of trip experiences, was determined through interviews with randomly selected students and teachers, held two or more weeks after a trip.

The evaluation team participated in a proportionate sample of trips for the varied grade levels and religious denominations including Roman Catholic, Hebrew, Greek Orthodox, Lutheran, and Episcopalian schools. Fifty-four trips involving pupils in grades one through eight in forty-three Catholic, six Hebrew, two Lutheran, and three Greek Orthodox schools were observed.

Four observers were used; each was trained in the proper use of observation and interview techniques. An observer accompanied the children on the trip from the time they left school until they returned. Observers arrived at a school about one half hour before the class making the trip was scheduled to leave. The observer introduced herself to the principal, who in turn introduced her to the teacher in charge of the trip. At this time, the observer gave the principal and the teacher a questionnaire to complete and return in a self-addressed envelope. During the course of the trip, the observer interviewed 15 children: five on the way to the trip site, five at the trip site, and five on the return trip. The observer also interviewed parent escorts. In addition, the observer noted salient characteristics of the trip, using a prepared observation form. Beginning in mid-April, questionnaires were returned by the teachers describing their pre-trip and post-trip lessons. Also, at this time,

questionnaires were sent to a sample of parents who had not accompanied their children on the trips. Finally, a sample number of post-trip retention evaluation interviews were held with children at a period of two or more weeks following their trip. See Appendix B for instruments used.

CHAPTER III. THE FINDINGS

A. INTERVIEWS WITH CHILDREN

There are many difficulties involved in attempting to analyze interview responses of children, not the least of which is the unreliability of children's answers. However, their responses are important and they must be considered seriously in order to obtain a total picture of the program's value.

In order to determine the extent to which field trips provided cultural and enrichment activities for children in grades one through eight, observers interviewed 15 children on each of the 54 trips studied; five children on the bus going to the site, five children at the site, and five children returning from the visit. An interview schedule was provided. In all, 270 interviews were conducted enroute to the site, 270 at the site and 270 on the return trip.

Although only 76.3 percent (206 pupils) of the students interviewed enroute to the site stated that their teachers had spent some time in class talking about the trip, almost all, 92.6 per cent of the students were aware of the trip's destination and purpose.

Pupils' reports on the amount and kind of preparation they were given were coded in terms of adequacy, indicating whether the preparation was good, routine or poor, or nonexistent. A rating of "good" was assigned when, according to pupil accounts, the teacher's advance preparation was germane to the anticipated trip's content. When advance preparation seemed to be of a general nature rather than specific as to content, or when it was composed essentially of admonitions concerning behavior, it

was rated as "routine or poor." When pupils indicated no recollection of preliminary class discussion prior to a trip, preparation was rated "nonexistent."

The accounts of 113 pupils (41.8 percent) indicated "good" preparation; the trip site was described, relevant questions were posed, and appropriate materials were distributed. In the case of 73 children (27.0 percent), preparation seemed to be behaviorally oriented and was rated as "routine or poor." Sixty-four of the students (23.7 percent) indicated that no preparation had been given. The remaining children could not recall whether or not the teacher had prepared them for the trip.

The following sample of responses to the questions asking children what they expected to see and what their teacher had said about the trip were considered as reflecting "good" preparation: "We're going to see all the Assembly Rooms and the Pavilion at the United Nations." "The U.N. originated in 1945 with 51 members." "The Security Council has 15 members and five are permanent." A seventh-grade child visiting Kennedy Airport reported being told "that in 1916 it took 20 hours to get from New York to Paris. In 1969 you can go on a round trip a few times a day." One fourth grader visiting the South Bronx Education Center recalled being told about African dances, instruments, and modern art. Responses rated as indicating "routine or poor" preparation included a report of a fourth-grade child who said the teacher "told us the rules not to touch, don't drink soda in the bus, and bring lunch with you", and a first grader who remembered being told, "Don't get lost and if you're not good you don't go."

It was obvious from the children's responses that the trips provided learning experiences not to be found within the confines of a classroom or neighborhood. Eighty-three percent of the children (225 pupils) interviewed on the bus during the return trip indicated that they had learned something. Responses were varied: a first grade boy returning from the Bronx Zoo stated "the giraffe only has 7 bones in his whole neck and the gorillas could climb with one hand"; a fifth grader leaving the Hayden Planetarium reported that, "you see black spots on the spectrum because of sodium"; another fifth grader following a visit to the Aquarium stated, "there really are such things as sea horses." One eighth-grade girl returning from Lincoln Center, said she learned about "the different stages and settings, and the people like Leonard Bernstein"; a boy learned about "architecture, composers, and the opera itself." Finally, a girl added that she learned "how beautiful things are if you only stop and look at them." All but five of the 270 children interviewed indicated that they would like to go on more trips to other places.

If the responses of the participating children may be looked upon as a valid indication of the extent to which field trips provided cultural and enrichment activities for children in grades one through eight, it is evident that the children benefited from such trips; that they learned conceptually; and that the field trips acted as a potential source of motivation and attitudinal change.

B. QUESTIONNAIRES TO TEACHERS IN CHARGE

Questionnaires were completed and returned by 45 (83.3 percent) of the 54 teachers in charge of selected samples of trips. Their responses were generally in agreement with observers' ratings and interviews. All

of the teachers indicated that they felt that the trips taken were valuable for the students. They noted a twofold value: 1. trips were related to curriculum and to conceptual growth, and 2. they exposed the children to experiences with which they would not ordinarily have come into contact. Typical responses as to the value of trips were: "In addition to contributing to learning about specific topics, the trips exposed the children to new places of interest that are nearby." "Our children get so little opportunity to see what our culture has to offer them. These trips allow them to leave the ghetto and see New York's better areas."

In addition, each of the responding teachers indicated that the trips were a learning experience. The following comments were made in response to a question asking teachers what the children learned: "Kennedy Airport is much bigger than they had thought." "They learned a great deal about the phases of the moon, the planned flights to the moon, and the different constellations (Hayden Planetarium)." "They learned how climate influenced living in these areas and how ideas and life were reflected in art work (Brooklyn Museum)."

Interview responses of the children and teacher responses to questionnaires both indicated that the field trips did indeed provide worthwhile cultural enrichment activities. In order to assess the extent to which these activities were organized efficiently, questionnaires completed by the teachers and principals, as well as schedules completed by the observers, were analyzed.

In general, teachers seemed to have sufficient knowledge as to when and where they were to take trips. Forty of the 45 teachers responding (88.9 percent) indicated that they had four or more weeks prior knowledge. The remaining teachers had known from two to four weeks before the scheduled trip.

Forty-two (93.3 percent) of the teachers who completed questionnaires stated that they had a choice concerning the destination of the trip. A handbook, Educational Field Trips in New York City, had been supplied to the teachers by the coordinator of the ESEA Title I trip program. The manual summarized some of the logistical problems (such as toll charges, parking fees, transportation facilities, and the necessity for making reservations) involved in planning a trip. In addition, the manual gave a capsule description of various trip sites which could be selected. Teachers were generally free to select any site considered to be of civic or cultural interest within the five boroughs of New York City.

All the teachers indicated that they knew in advance what was to be seen on the trip. Teachers were asked to describe how they prepared pupils in advance of the trip. Their responses were coded as either "good preparation," "general preparation," or "routine or poor preparation." When the preparation was relevant to the trip and concerned with its content, it was classified as "good." When preparation seemed to consist primarily of general statements concerning what would be seen, it was noted as "general preparation." "Routine or poor preparation" concerned itself primarily with behavior rules. Fourteen (31.1 percent) of the 45 teachers gave responses which indicated that they provided their classes with "good preparation." Twenty teachers (44.4 percent) were rated as providing "general preparation," while 11 teachers (24.4 percent) gave what was categorized as "routine or poor preparation." One example of good preparation provided by a teacher who was scheduled to take her first grade class to Flushing Zoo was "I had pictures of wild and tame animals. We discussed foods and habitation of each. We

had records about animals and saw TV programs."

Teachers were asked to state their conception of the educational purposes of the trips. Because many teachers gave more than one response to the question, the total percentage exceeds 100. Table III-1 shows the distribution of responses to this question. Approximately two-thirds of the teachers noted a positive correlation with the curriculum and recognized this as a major factor in the educational value of the trip.

TABLE III-1

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS WHEN ASKED, "WHAT WERE THE EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES OF THIS TRIP?"
(N=45)

	Number of Responses	Percent of Respondents
Correlation with curriculum	29	64.4
Increase of general knowledge	11	24.4
Cultural and civic enrichment	10	22.2
Positive group experience	7	15.5
Knowledge of features of site	3	6.6

When specifically asked how the trip related to class work, 39 (86.6 percent) of the 45 teachers mentioned some specific form of subject matter correlation. Teachers also saw the trips as increasing the children's general knowledge and cultural and civic enrichment.

Teachers' responses to questions asking how the educational value of trips might be increased and what suggestions or criticisms they had are summarized in Table III-2. Thirty teachers, two-thirds of the respondents, indicated that they were completely satisfied with the program as it stood. No overriding factor was indicated by teachers as being necessary

to increase the educational value of the trip program. The most frequently mentioned suggestions involved the need for more teacher preparation in the form of charts and visual aids, which might be supplied by sites, and the need for guided tours.

TABLE III-2

RESPONSES GIVEN BY TEACHERS WHEN ASKED, "HOW COULD THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF THESE TRIPS BE INCREASED?"
(N=39)

	Number of Responses	Percent of Respondents
More teacher preparation	8	20.5
Guided tour at site	7	17.9
Follow-up in class	5	12.8
More trips during the year	4	10.2
Longer trips	3	7.6
Smaller groups	2	5.1
Others	10	2.5

Using the responses of teachers as one basis for determining the extent to which the experiences of the trip program were organized efficiently, one may conclude that several, but not all, aspects of the program were well planned. According to teacher reports, they obtained prior knowledge of the trips schedule and were given the freedom to select trip sites. These factors are considered important to the success of this program. A great majority (five of every six teachers responding) indicated the positive correlation of trips to curriculum and subject matter. However, a much smaller proportion (one out of every three) seemed to be aware of the social, cultural, and civic enrichment potential in a trip situation. Moreover, when the reports of teachers and those of children were analyzed, only approximately one-third of the preparatory class

activities were rated as "good," in that they were germane to the trip and specifically informative. Two-thirds were judged to consist solely of generalities or details concerning behavior and routines. This factor decreases the potential effectiveness of the trip program. Teachers should provide more preparation in advance of each trip; the attention of pupils should be focused on particular aspects to be observed or questions to be answered. Preparation for a class trip should deal primarily with the content of the prospective trip, not with patterns for behavior and routines. Some form of teacher instruction relating to amount and type of class preparation might serve to increase the educational value of trips.

C. QUESTIONNAIRES TO PRINCIPALS

Thirty-seven (69.8 percent) of the 53 participating principals completed and returned questionnaires. These forms were analyzed to determine more fully the effectiveness of the organization of bus trips as cultural enrichment activities.

Principals were asked what kind of orientation teachers received concerning the bus trips. Thirty-three principals responded to this question. Table III-3 lists their answers.

TABLE III-3

RESPONSES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS WHEN ASKED, "WHAT KIND OF ORIENTATION DO TEACHERS GET CONCERNING BUS TRIPS?" (N=33)

	Number of Responses	Percent of Respondents
Brochures	17	51.5
Discussion at school	13	39.4
Site visit by teachers	3	9.1
Board of Education discussion	2	6.1
None	1	3.0
Other	12	36.4

As indicated in Table III-3, over half of the principals responding stated that teachers were familiarized with aspects of the bus trip programs only through the distribution of brochures and materials supplied by the Board of Education and various trip sites. In addition, 13 principals said teachers were oriented through preliminary discussions at school.

Principals also were requested to describe the preparation procedures adopted by teachers prior to visiting a particular site. Responses were coded as "minimal preparation given" (teachers gave students behavior instructions, name of site, read brochures to pupils); "general preparation given" (teachers described to the class what would be seen on the prospective trip); or "special preparation given" (teachers assigned extra reading, utilized related TV program, initiated class discussion, conducted special projects and visited site prior to trip). Fourteen (40.0 percent) of the principals indicated that their teachers gave special preparation in advance of the bus trip, while 11 (31.4 percent) indicated general preparation; 10 principals (28.6 percent) gave responses classified as minimal preparation.

Approximately 92.0 percent of the principals (34 out of 37 responses) said that classroom teachers accompanied their own classes on trips. All principals indicated that teachers' reactions to the trips were highly positive.

Table III-4 indicates responses of principals concerning the bases on which suitable trips were chosen. The largest number of respondents (19 out of 37) indicated that the selection of a trip site was made by teacher decision; 14 principals indicated that this selection was made on the basis of age, grade level, and ability of the children. There is an overlap in this item in that the responses really included "who" made the

decision as well as "on what basis" it was made, without clearly separating the two aspects.

TABLE III-4

RESPONSES GIVEN BY PRINCIPALS WHEN ASKED, "HOW IS IT DECIDED WHICH CHILDREN GO TO WHICH TRIP SITE?"
(N=37)

	Number of Responses	Percent of Respondents
Teachers' decision	19	51.3
Appropriateness to age, grade level, and ability	14	37.8
All grades go	6	16.2
Faculty committee decision	4	10.8
Principals' decision	1	2.7

Principals were also asked a number of questions pertaining to parent participation in the program. (Approximately 90 percent of the parents acting as trip escorts were recruited by note, letter, phone, or in person.) In reference to parent cooperation, all but two of the principals stated that parents were fully cooperative. About one fourth of the principals indicated that some parents refused to allow their children to participate in the bus trip program. This was, however, an infrequent occurrence. A typical comment was, "Very seldom do parents refuse to allow their children to go on trips. Occasionally parents refuse if they are over-protective or if the child is sickly. Generally speaking, parents are delighted to have their children go out with the group."

Seventeen of the principals responding (45.9 percent) felt that all children were equally responsive to the bus trips. However, a much larger percent felt that the middle age groups (7 to 12) were more responsive than

either the younger (5 to 6) or older (13 to 14) children. Table III-5 shows the distribution of responses to this question.

TABLE III-5

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS WHEN ASKED, "WHAT AGE GROUPS SEEM MOST RESPONSIVE TO THE BUS TRIPS?"
(N=37)

	Number of Responses	Percent of Respondents
5 to 6	4	10.8
7 to 8	12	32.4
9 to 10	13	35.1
11 to 12	13	35.1
13 to 14 or over	5	13.5
All	17	45.9

In addition to being asked to describe their feelings about the present trip program, principals were requested to indicate how they felt the educational value of the trips might be increased. Table III-6 summarizes their suggestions. The most frequent suggestions for improvement involved more extensive teacher preparation and classroom follow-up. Thirty-eight percent of the principals indicated complete satisfaction with the bus trip program.

The responses on principals' questionnaires relating to the effectiveness of the bus trip program indicate the need for more specifically appropriate content oriented class preparation. Only 40 percent of the principals' responses regarding teachers' preparation of their classes noted special preparation including such items as extra reading assignments, utilization of related T.V. programs, and class discussions. There seems to be a need for a stronger in-service instructional program which

TABLE III-6

SUGGESTIONS MADE BY PRINCIPALS AS TO HOW THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF THE BUS TRIPS MIGHT BE INCREASED
(N=37)

	Number of Responses	Percent of Respondents
More extensive teacher preparation	8	21.6
Follow-up in class	8	21.6
Others	8	21.6
More trips during the year	3	8.1
Smaller groups	1	2.7
No answer	14	37.8

will help teachers to utilize trips as an integral part of the school curriculum. All other aspects of the trip program including suitability of trips, parent participation, educational value, and children's responsiveness were seen by the principals to be most worthwhile.

D. OBSERVATIONS DURING THE BUS TRIPS

As a final assessment of the extent to which the cultural and enrichment experiences of the bus trip program were organized in an efficient manner, certain factors noted and recorded by trip observers were analyzed. Of the 54 trips studied, bus loads ranged from a low of 25 to 29 children to a high of 55 to 59 children. The mean was 38 children per bus load. In each of the 54 trips observed, there was at least one teacher on each bus; 13 trips had two teachers on a bus. On 17 of the trips, no parents were in attendance; on the remainder at least one parent attended, and in one case there were 10 parents. The average number of parents per trip was two.

In all instances, the observers rated the initial loading of the children onto the buses as being smoothly accomplished. During only four of the 54 trips was it necessary to use extraordinary control measures because of disciplinary disturbances enroute to the trip site. Likewise, control of classes at the trip sites was rated as very good. In only two cases did observers rate adult control as poor. On the return trip, loadings were generally rated as smooth. In two exceptions, where bus loading was rated as needing improvement, the problem was due to the late arrival of buses. Of the 54 trips observed, only five instances were noted in which there was need to use repressive measures to maintain control. All were due to insufficient control on the return trips.

At the trip site, in 18 of 54 cases the classes were subdivided into smaller groups for convenience and better management. Such subdivision was made feasible because of the presence of parent escorts. This practice was most efficient and is recommended for increased use.

In all but one case, observers reported that children expressed a great deal of interest in the trip site. In 24 instances 44.5 percent of the observers recorded various questions which children asked in relation to what they were seeing. In other cases, the children expressed interest in other ways such as crowding around exhibits, eagerly answering questions, reading details on explanatory plaques, informing teachers of facts they had learned, and so forth.

Although observers reported that children communicated and were involved with one another throughout the trips, only in five instances was meaningful co-mingling with children from other schools noted. Thus, the social or group experience value of the trip program was centered solely within an individual class.

Observers were asked to note any "unusual circumstances" on their trips. Most observations recorded no unusual occurrences. Those that were listed involved bus lateness and lack of clear or specific prior arrangements concerning trip sites, resulting in confusion as to admission or luncheon facilities. Such confusion occurred in only a small number of instances.

In general, then, bus trips were efficiently organized, observers reporting, almost without exception, that they were well conducted, meaningful experiences for the children

E. PARENT INTERVIEWS

In an attempt to evaluate the amount of communication between parents and children resulting from the trip experiences, 67 interviews with parent escorts were obtained by observers during the trip. As previously reported, the number of parents per trip varied considerably. Of those interviewed during this study, 38 (56.7 percent) had previously served on similar trips. The overwhelming majority of these parents had been invited by their children's teachers or by the children themselves. The remaining few had been asked by the principal or had volunteered. There was almost an even breakdown between those who had received instructions about the trip from the teachers or principals and those who had not.

All but two of the parents interviewed believed that the children had benefited from the trips. Two parents felt that the children had not benefited due to insufficient time or inadequate site arrangements. Parents were asked to indicate what they considered to be the educational purposes of such a trip. While 7 (11.1 percent) of the responding parents indicated that they believed the trip to have specific correlation to class work, 56 (88.8 percent) thought the value to be more of

an increase in "general knowledge" whereby the children had the opportunity to see things they had never seen before. A few parents did not respond to this question.

Similarly, parents were asked for their suggestions for increasing the educational value of the trips and their general comments and criticisms. Most answered that they did not know or had no specific suggestion or criticism to make. However, 19 (28.4 percent) of the parents suggested that the children go on more trips during the year and 14 (20.9 percent) thought that a guided tour would be a most valuable addition for the children.

The responses of parent escorts were highly favorable to the trip program. They expressed the opinion that an educational value existed; they felt that the children benefited a great deal.

F. PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES

A total of 67 (30.5 percent) of the 220 questionnaires distributed were returned by parents who had not accompanied their children on the bus trips. This questionnaire was designed to ascertain the degree of parent-child communication fostered by the trips. When asked, "How long before the trip did your child tell you he was to go on a school bus trip?", 52 (77.6 percent) of the respondents indicated that they had been informed at least one week in advance. In addition, almost half of the parents indicated that their children had told them some details about where they were going and what they were going to see. This agreed with information obtained from interviews with children at the trip sites. Approximately 88 percent of these children (238 out of 270) indicated that they had told their parents they were going on a trip and at least indicated the trip's destination.

Several questions were specifically designed to ascertain the degree of communication following a child's return from a field trip. These are summarized in Table III-7. Sixty-five parents responded to this question.

TABLE III-7

PARENTS' RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING ASPECTS OF BUS TRIPS
(N = 65)

	Yes	No
Did child learn anything?	65	0
Would child like more trips?	65	0
Do you think bus trips have educational value?	65	0
Did child say he enjoyed trip?	64	1
Is family planning a revisit?	63	2

An overwhelming number of parents indicated that their children enjoyed the trips, that these trips were of educational value, and that the children would like to go on more trips to other places. In response to the question, "Did your child learn anything on this trip?", typical parental responses included: "He talked about the exhibits for several days afterwards." (Aquarium); "He told about the people he had seen from different countries and their dress." (United Nations); "She told me about how the early Indians lived and the weapons they used." (Museum of Natural History); "She talks about the marriage ceremonies of the Chinese, their fashions, food and chopsticks." (Chinatown Museum).

When asked what suggestions or criticisms they had concerning the bus trips, 40 parents (59.7 percent) indicated that they had none. Seventeen parents (25.3 percent) suggested that more trips should be taken to other sites. Ten parents (14.9 percent) thought that guided tours should be given.

In evaluating the extent to which the cultural and curriculum enrichment experiences of bus trips had fostered parent-child communication, parent questionnaires indicated that children had told parents about their trips prior to going and shared their experiences with them upon their return. This is corroborated by the children's statements, both at the site and in follow-up interviews, that they had informed their parents of the trip.

G. PRE-TRIP LESSONS

In order to determine the amount and type of classroom preparation for the bus trip, teachers were asked to fill out questionnaires in regard to their pre-trip lessons. The use of such questionnaires did not begin until mid-April. Of the 28 distributed, 20 questionnaires (71.4 percent) were completed and returned by the teachers.

Eighteen of the 20 respondents indicated that their lessons ranged in length from about 15 to 45 minutes. Some indicated that there were two or more lessons pertaining to their forthcoming trip. All 20 teachers noted that the pre-trip lessons were taught by the children's regular classroom teacher. In rating the children's interest and enthusiasm for the pre-trip lessons, 13 (65.0 percent) of the teachers rated these as higher than average. Two teachers considered the enthusiasm of the children to be outstanding, while five rated it as average.

Teachers were also asked to indicate the children's degree of participation. Nine teachers (45.0 percent) indicated that almost every child was actively involved. An additional nine responded that more than half of the class participated. One teacher did not respond and one indicated that less than half of the children participated. In rating the children's behavior during the pre-trip lesson, one teacher stated that the class was

extremely well behaved. Sixteen teachers (80.0 percent) indicated that the classes were well behaved, while three stated that some children were well behaved and some were poorly behaved. Fifteen of the 20 teachers (75.0 percent) indicated that teaching aids such as films, pictures, records, and the like were utilized during the lessons.

In order to ascertain what aspects of the trips were discussed, teachers were given a list of topics and asked to indicate which had been covered in their classes. Table III-8 summarizes their responses. The topics most frequently discussed involved simple rules of conduct, safety precautions, money to be spent, and provision for eating as well as aspects of the site to be visited.

TABLE III-8

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS CONCERNING THE TOPICS DISCUSSED IN PRE-TRIP LESSONS WITH THEIR CLASS
(N = 20)

Topics	Number of Responses
Simple rules of conduct	19
Safety precautions .	19
Money to spend on trip	19
Provision for eating	19
Site to be visited .	19
Means of transportation	18
Grouping of children	18
Plans for parents to accompany children	16
Directions about what to do if people become lost or are left behind	15
Rules of dress	14
Time to be spent traveling and at the site	14
Provision for children not going on trip	8

Teachers were asked to describe the main ideas about the site that had been discussed with the children. Evaluators rated the teachers' responses as indicating "good prepartion" which was specific to the trip and content oriented, or as "poor or routine preparation" which lacked specificity or content orientation. Half of the responses were rated as indicating "good preparation" while the remaining half indicated "poor or routine preparation."

Responses from pre-trip lesson questionnaires indicated that teachers felt the children's reactions were generally good, their interest and participation excellent. Class behavior also seemed to be improved. About 50 percent of the lessons as reported by the teachers appeared to indicate good preparation for the trip.

H. POST-TRIP LESSONS

In addition to the pre-trip lesson forms, post-trip lesson questionnaires were analyzed to determine the amount and type of classroom follow-up of the cultural and enrichment experiences of the bus trip program. These forms went into use in mid-April. Only nine questionnaires of the 28 distributed were returned by the teachers. One teacher indicated that the amount of forms amassed by the Board of Education, bus orders, trip site reservations, and evaluation reports was overwhelming.

All of the post-trip lessons were carried on by the children's regular classroom teacher. They ranged in length from about 20 to 45 minutes. Two teachers indicated that more than one follow-up lesson was given. Five of the nine teachers indicated that the children's interest and enthusiasm were keener than average. Two rated the children as having outstanding interest and the remaining two indicated just average interest.

In stating the degree of children's participation in the lessons,

four teachers indicated that almost every child actively participated while five teachers said more than half the class participated. Children were rated as extremely well behaved by one-third of the teachers. The remaining two-thirds indicated that during the post-trip lessons children were fairly well behaved. In no case were the children said tc be poorly behaved.

Two-thirds of the teachers stated that teaching aids such as films, records or pictures were used in the post-trip lesson. Table III-9 summarizes teacher statements of class projects which were undertaken and discussed as a result of their trip. Of these, the most frequent was a bulletin board display.

TABLE III-9

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS INDICATING PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN IN POST-TRIP LESSONS (N=9)

Projects	Number of Responses
Setting up a bulletin board	7
Writing thank you letters	5
Exhibits of photos	4
Articles in class or school newspaper	4
Writing a diary	1
Others	3

I. CHILDREN'S RETENTION OF EXPERIENCES

In order to determine the holding effect and degree of retention of the cultural and curriculum enrichment experiences provided by the bus trip program, the evaluation team returned to 10 classes during a period of two or more weeks following the trip. Five children were interviewed at each school. A total of 50 interviews were obtained.

Ninety percent of the students interviewed (45 out of 50) said that they would like to revisit the site of their trip. Over half (28 children) named a specific aspect of the trip that was of special interest to them as a reason for wishing to return. When asked whether they had talked about the trip with anyone at home, 48 children (96.0 percent) responded that they had. This correlated with the response of parent questionnaires in which parents indicated that the children talked excitedly about their trips.

Only three of the 50 children interviewed had revisited the site since they had been on the school trip. All of the children indicated that they would like to take more trips to other places. In an attempt to ascertain how much the children could recall of what they had seen and learned, children were asked what they remembered most about the trip. Some of the answers follow: "The unfinished wall which meant he couldn't finish it until there was peace." (United Nations); "The pigs and how dirty they are." (Flushing Zoo); "Leonard Bernstein conducting the orchestra." (Lincoln Center); "How the planes taxi up to the place where the people get off and how the truck goes all the way up to the planes and gets the food up." (Kennedy Airport).

At the time of the retention interviews, the children were still very much excited about what they had seen. Their responses were clear and indicated knowledge gained and retained. Beyond doubt the children themselves have shown that the field trips taken did indeed provide the worthwhile cultural and curriculum enrichment intended.

CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report describes the findings of a study of an educational bus trip program for disadvantaged children. The schools participating in this program are located in neighborhoods certified as poverty areas by the New York City Council Against Poverty. Many of the children had never before traveled more than a few blocks from their homes. These trips offered disadvantaged children the opportunity of participating in cultural enrichment activities not likely to be offered within their normal daily experiences.

In general, the bus trip program was well conducted. Responses of children indicated a great deal of interest in the trips which served as a kind of real learning experience not to be obtained within the confines of the classroom or neighborhood. Teachers' and principals' questionnaires indicated efficient program coordination. The major drawback to the program seemed to be insufficient relevant and worthwhile class preparation for trips. Parents were enthusiastic and cooperative. The trips seemed to foster communication between parents and children both in relation to such routine matters as permission slips and lunch bags, and a sharing of interest and recounting by the children of what they had seen. Followup interviews with the children indicated that they retained a great deal of specific information gained from the trips. Enthusiasm for and interest in the trip program remained high.

The following recommendations are offered as means of strengthening an already valuable program:

1. Teachers should provide more structure in advance of each trip so that pupils can focus their attention on particular aspects of the trip being planned. Specific questions should be posed which the trip experi-

ence will help to answer. Preparation of a class should deal primarily with the content of the prospective trip and not with patterns for behavior and routines.

2. Teachers should be given the opportunity to visit trip sites prior to scheduled trips so that more effective advance preparation of the children could result.

3. Greater effort should be made to see to it that parent escorts accompany all trips to provide supervision for smaller trip site grouping. This is particularly important for visits at which no tour guide is available.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

	Page
Educational Bus Trip Observation	B1
Teacher's Questionnaire	B14
Principal's Questionnaire	B16
Parent Questionnaire	B19
Parent Questionnaire	B21
Teacher Questionnaire Pre-Trip Lesson	B23
Teacher Questionnaire Post-Trip Lesson	B26
Children's Questionnaire on Retention	B28

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

Educational Bus Trip Observation

Trip Site _____ School _____

Grade(s) on bus _____ _____

Time bus left school _____ _____

Time bus returned to school _____ Principal _____

Observer _____ Date _____

Section I. From School to Trip Site

Name of Teacher in charge of bus _____

Other teachers on bus _____

If no others, check here _____

Number of parents on bus _____

If none, check here _____

If there were any other adults (besides observer and driver), specify who they were:

_____

_____

Number of children on bus _____

Sex of children on bus:

Boys only _____

Girls only _____

Boys and girls ___

1. Did the process of getting the children on the bus go smoothly? ____Yes ____ No
   Comment on anything unusual that happened during the loading.

2. Indicate the grade and class composition of the children on the bus. Was the class of the teacher in charge on the bus? Was there intact classes or were classes separated?

3. After listening to several of the children's conversations, list children's comments about the trip. Also indicate what were some of the topics they were discussing.

4. What methods did the adult in charge use to maintain control over the children? How successful was he?

Interview with Children on Bus

A. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Do you know where you are going? (Where?) _____
2. What do you expect to see?

3. Did you teacher spend any time in class talking about the trip? ____ Yes ____ No
   What did she tell you about it?

4. What bus trips have you gone on before this one?

5. (If there were previous trips) What did you see there?

6. Did you talk about (site of previous trip) afterwards in class? ____ Yes ____ No
   What was said?

B. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Do you know where you are going? (Where?) _____
2. What do you expect to see?

3. Did your teacher spend any time inclass talking about the trip? ____ Yes ____ No
   What did she tell you about it?

4. What bus trips have you gone on before this one?

5. (If there were previous trips) What did you see there?

6. Did you talk about (site of previous trip) afterwards in class? ____ Yes ____ No
   What was said?

C. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Do you know where you are going? (Where?) _____
2. What do you expect to see?

3. Did your teacher spend any time in class talking about the trip? ____ Yes ____ No
   What did she tell you about it?

4. What bus trips have you gone on before this one?

5. (If there were previous trips) What did you see there?

6. Did you talk about (site of previous trip) afterwards in class? ____ Yes ____ No
   What was said?

D. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Do you know where you are going? (Where ?) _____
2. What do you expect to see? _____

3. Did your teacher spend any time in class talking about the trip? ____ Yes ____ No
   What did she tell you about it?

4. What bus trips have you gone on before this one?

5. (If there were previous trips) What did you see there?

6. D id you talk about (site of previous trip) afterwards in class? ____ Yes ____ No
   What was said?

E. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Do you know where you are going? (Where?) _____
2. What do you expect to see?

3. Did your teacher spend any time in class talking about the trip? ____ Yes ____ No
   What did she tell you about it?

4. What bus trips have you gone on before this one?

5. (If there were previous trips) What did you see there?

6. Did you talk about (site of previous trip) afterwards in class? ____ Yes ____ No
   What was said?

Section II. At Trip Site

1. Did the group of children from the bus remain intact? _____ Yes _____ No
   If not, how were they separated?

2. In the group you accompanied at the site, state:

   No. of children _____
   Grade _____
   Sex _____
   Adults _____ (specify: tour guide, teacher, parent, etc.)
   _____
   _____

3. What methods did the adult in charge use to maintain control over the children?
   How successful was he?

4. In what ways did the children express interest in the trip site? List any questions they asked.

5. In what aspects of the trip site did the children appear most interested?

6. Was there any evidence of co-mingling with children from other schools? _____ Yes _____ No
   If so, how did this occur? (during lunch, film program, etc.)

Interview with Children at Trip Site

F. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Have you ever been here before? ____Yes ____No
   (If yes, find out under what circumstances - school trip, with parents, etc.)

2. Did you tell your mother or father where you were going today? ____Yes ____No
   (Find out what was said by child or parents.)

3. Which things interest you the most? Why?

4. Do you have any questions that you hope to have answered during this trip? ____Yes ____No
   (List them.)

G. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Have you ever been here before? ____Yes ____No
   (If yes, find out under what circumstances - school trip, with parents, etc.)

2. Did you tell your mother or father where you were going today? ____Yes ____No
   (Find out what was said by child or parents.)

3. Which things interest you the most? Why?

4. Do you have any questions that you hope to have answered during this trip? ____Yes ____No
   (List them.)

H. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Have you ever been here before? _____ Yes _____ No
(If yes, find out under what circumstances - school trip, with parents, etc.)

2. Did you tell your mother or father where you were going today? _____ Yes _____ No
(Find out what was said by child or parents.)

3. Which things interest you the most? Why?

4. Do you have any questions that you hope to have answered during this trip? _____ Yes _____ No
(List them.)

I. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Have you ever been here before? _____ Yes _____ No
(If yes, find out under what circumstances - school trip, with parents, etc.)

2. Did you tell your mother or father where you were going today? _____ Yes _____ No
(Find out what was said by child or parents.)

3. Which things interest you the most? Why?

4. Do you have any questions that you hope to have answered during this trip? _____ Yes _____ No
(List them.).

J. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Have you ever been here before? _____ Yes _____ No
   (If yes, find out under what circumstances - school trip, with parents, etc.)

2. Did you tell your mother or father where you were going today? _____ Yes _____ No
   (Find out what was said by child or parents.)

3. Which things interest you the most? Why?

4. Do you have any questions that you hope to have answered during this trip? _____ Yes _____ No
   (List them.)

Section III. Return from Trip Site to School

1. Was the group on the bus the same as before? _____ Yes _____ No
   If not, indicate the changes.

2. Did the process of getting the children on the bus go smoothly? _____ Yes _____ No
   Comment on anything unusual that happened during the loading. Compare with start of trip.

3. After listening to several of the children's conversations, list the topics of as many of the conversations as you can.

4. What methods did the adult in charge use to maintain control over the children? How successful was he? (More or less than previously?)

5. Comment on any unusual circumstances during the trip.

Interview with Children on Return Bus Trip

Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Would you like to go to (name of trip site) again? _____ Yes ____ No. Why?

2. How would you get back to (name of trip site) if you had to get there by yourself? (Probe for detail.)

3. Did you learn anything on this trip? _____Yes _____ No. What?

4. Would you like to go on more of these trips to other places? _____ Yes_____ No Where?

L. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Would you like to go to (name of trip site) again? _____ Yes _____ No. Why?

2. How would you get back to (Name of trip site) if you had to ge there by yourself? (Probe for detail.)

3. Did you learn anything on this trip? _____ Yes _____ No What?

4. Would youlike to go on more of these trips to other places? _____ Yes _____ No. Where?

M. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Would you like to go to (name of trip site) again? _____ Yes _____ No. Why?

2. How would you get back to (name of trip site) if you had to get there by yourself? (Probe for detail.)

3. Did you learn anything on this trip? _____ Yes _____ No. What?

4. Would you like to go on more of these trips to other places? _____ Yes _____ No. Where?

N. Child's Name _____ Grade _____ Age _____

1. Would you like to go to (name of trip site) again? _____ Yes _____ No. Why?

2. How would you get back to (Name of trip site) if you had to get there by yourself? (Probe for detail.)

3. Did you learn anything on this trip? _____ Yes _____ No. What?

4. Would you like to go on more of these trips to other places? _____ Yes _____ No Where?

O. Child's Name_____ Grade_____ Age_____

1. Would you like to go to (name of trip site) again? _____ Yes _____ No. Why?

2. How would you get back to (name of trip site) if you had to get there by yourself? (Probe for detail.)

3. Did you learn anything on this trip? _____ Yes _____ No. What?

4. Would you like to go on more of these trips to other places? _____ Yes _____ No. Where?

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

Educational Bus Trips

Teacher's Questionnaire

Teacher_____ School_____

Grade Taught_____ Trip Site_____ Date_____

1. How long before today did you know just where and when you were going on this trip?

2. Did you have any choice concerning where to go on this trip? _____ Yes _____ No
   In what way?

3. Did you know in advance what was to be seen at the trip site? _____Yes _____ No

4. How did you prepare your pupils in advance for this trip?

5. Did you enjoy the trip? _____ Yes _____ No
   Why?

6. How did the children indicate enjoyment or lack of enjoyment of the trip?

7. Do you think these kinds of trips are valuable? _____ Yes _____ No
   Why?

8. Do you think the children learned anything on this trip? _____ Yes _____ No
   What?

9. Was there anything about this trip that you can relate to class work? _____ Yes _____ No
   What? How?

10. Was this trip suited to the needs and interests of this particular group? _____ Yes _____ No
    Please comment.

11. What were the educational purposes of this trip?

12. How could the educational value of these trips be increased?

13. Can you suggest some places that you think would be valuable for your class to visit?

14. What criticisms do you have of the bus trip program in general?

15. What suggestions can you offer for improving the bus trip program?

Center for Urban Education

105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

Educational Bus Trips

Principal's Questionnaire

Principal _____ Total No. of Busses Today: _____

School _____ Grades Involved Today: _____

Date _____ Trip Destination(s) Today _____

_____

1. What kind of orientation do teachers get concerning bus trips?

2. How do teachers prepare in advance for a visit to a particular site?

3. Does each classroom teacher accompany her own class? _____ Yes _____ No

4. If lunch is included in a trip, what provision is made for children who are on a free lunch period?

5. How do you recruit parent volunteers to go on bus trips?

6. Are the parents cooperative in response to these requests? _____ Yes _____ No

7. Do any parents refuse to allow their children to go on these trips? _____ Yes _____ No
If so, how many? What are their reasons?

8. What feedback have you had from parents in reaction to the bus trips, particularly from those who accompanied trips?

9. What reactions have you had from teachers concerning the educational value of these trips?

10. How is it decided which children go to which trip sites?

11. To what extent do you screen requests or confer with teachers so as to decide on the suitability of a particular trip destination for a particular grade level?

12. What age groups seem most responsive to the bus trips?

13. What discipline problems, if any, have been encountered on these trips?

14. What are the educational purposes of today's trip(s)? If busses are going to more than one trip site today, please comment for each site.

15. How could the educational value of these trips be increased?

16. Can you suggest some places that you think would be valuable for the children to visit?

17. Have you mixed different grade levels on the same bus? _____ Yes _____ No
If so, was this an asset or a liability? Does it make any difference?

18. What criticisms do you have of the bus trip program in general?

19. Do you think the bus trip program should be continued? _____ Yes _____ No
Expanded? _____ Yes _____ No.
Why?

20. What suggestions can you offer for improving the bus trip program?

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

18 Educational Field Trips for Non-Public School Pupils

Parent Questionnaire

Name _____ School _____

Child's Grade _____ Trip Site _____

Date _____

1. Did you ever serve as a chaperon on a school bus trip before this? _____ Yes _____ No

2. Who asked you to go on this trip? _____ Principal _____ Teacher _____ Child
_____ Volunteered

3. Did the teacher or principal give you any instructions on what to do during the trip?
_____ Yes _____ No
If yes, explain how: _____

_____

4. What do you think were the educational purposes of this trip? _____

_____

5. How do you think the educational value of these trips could be increased? _____

_____

6. Do you think the children benefited from this trip? _____ Yes _____ No
   If yes, explain how:

7. What suggestions or criticisms do you have of this bus trip? If none, check here:_____

Center for Urban Education
Educational Field Trips in Nonpublic Schools

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

School _____ Date _____

Name _____

Place visited by your child _____

Dear Parent:

We represent the Center for Urban Education which has been designated to evaluate the educational field trip program that your child has participated in.

In order to get a clear picture of the success of this program, we feel that we need to know the opinions and reactions of the parents of the children involved. Therefore, we are sending you this questionnaire for that purpose. We would appreciate it if you would take the time to fill out the following questionnaire and mail it to us in the enclosed envelope. Since our report is due soon, please return it at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

Thomas G. Vinci

Thomas G. Vinci
Evaluation Director

- - - - - - - - - - -

Directions: Please answer the following questions. We are particularly interested in your opinions, attitudes and criticism of the educational field trip program. All information will be held as part of the evaluation of the program and your answers will be held in strictest confidence.

1. When did your child tell you that he or she was going on a school bus trip?

   _____ one week before the trip
   _____ three days before the trip
   _____ one day before the trip
   _____ morning of the trip
   _____ other. Please indicate: _____

2. What information did your child give you about where he was going and what he was going to see?

   _____

3. Did your child tell you that

_____ he enjoyed the trip
_____ he did not enjoy the trip

Explain why _____

4. Did your child learn anything on this trip?

_____ Yes
_____ No

Please tell why you think so _____

_____

5. From talking to your child, do you think he would like to go on more of these trips to other places?

_____ Yes
_____ No

Where would he like to go? _____

6. Are you and your family planning to revisit the place your child visited today?

_____ Yes
_____ No

Explain why _____

7. Do you think that taking school bus trips has any educational value?

_____ Yes
_____ No

Explain why _____

8. What suggestions or criticisms do you have about the school bus trip your child took today?

_____

_____

_____

_____

B23

Center for Urban Education
Educational Research Committee
Educational Field Trips in Nonpublic Schools

Dear Teacher:

We would appreciate your answering the following questionnaire prior to your bus trip. This information will make possible a fuller evaluation of the program. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope at your earliest convenience.

We look forward to meeting you and your children on the day of the trip.

Yours sincerely,

Thomas G. Vinci

Thomas G. Vinci

- - - - - - - - - - -

Teacher Questionnaire

PRE-TRIP LESSON

School & Borough _____ Grade _____ Class _____ Number of Boys ___ Number of Girls ___

Teacher's Name _____ Circle Sex M F

Date of Lesson: _____ Length of Lesson _____

Date of Scheduled Trip _____ Trip Site _____

1. Who taught the pre-trip lesson?

   _____ Regular classroom teacher
   _____ "Cluster teacher"
   _____ Special Staff. Indicate who: _____

2. How would you rate the children's interest and enthusiasm for the pre-trip lesson?

   _____ Outstanding
   _____ Better than average
   _____ Average
   _____ Below Average

3. How would you rate the participation of the children in the pre-trip lesson?

   _____ Almost every child actively involved
   _____ More than half the class participated
   _____ Less than one half participated
   _____ Few children participated

4. How would you rate the children's behavior during the pre-trip lesson?

_____Extremely well behaved
_____Well behaved
_____Some well, some poorly behaved
_____Mostly poorly behaved

5. Were teaching aids utilized in this pre-trip lesson, e.g., films, records, pictures, etc.?

_____Yes
_____No

If yes, indicate the teaching aid(s) used:_____

6. Did you and children discuss the following? (Note: Indicate approximate percentage of lesson time devoted to each category checked.)

	Yes	No	Per cent
a. Simple rules of conduct			
b. Rules of dress			
c. Safety precautions			
d. Directions about what to do if people get lost or are left behind			
e. Provision for children not going on trip			
f. Means of transportation			
g. Money to spend on trip			
h. Provision for eating			
i. Plans for parents to accompany children			
j. Grouping of children			
k. Time to be spent traveling and at the site			
l. Site to be visited			
		Total	100%

7. Describe the main ideas about the site that you and the children discussed (most important first, next most important second, etc.).

1. _____

_____

_____

2. _____

_____

_____

3. _____

_____

_____

B26
Center for Urban Education
Educational Research Committee
Educational Field Trips in Nonpublic Schools

Teacher Questionnaire

POST-TRIP LESSON

School & Borough _____ Grade ____ Class ____ Number of Boys ____ Number of Girls ____

Teacher's Name _____ Circle Sex M F

Date of Trip _____ Trip Site _____

Date of Lesson _____ Length of Lesson _____

1. Who taught the post-trip lesson?

_____ Regular classroom teacher
_____ "Cluster teacher"
_____ Special Staff. Indicate who: _____

2. How would you rate the children's interest and enthusiasm for the post-trip lesson?

_____ Outstanding
_____ Better than average
_____ Average
_____ Below average

3. How would you rate the participation of the children in the post-trip lesson?

_____ Almost every child actively involved
_____ More than half the class participated
_____ Less than one half participated
_____ Few children participated

4. How would you rate the children's behavior during the post-trip lesson

_____ Extremely well behaved
_____ Well behaved
_____ Some well, some poorly behaved
_____ Mostly poorly behaved

5. Were teaching aids utilized in the post-trip lesson, e.g., films, records, pictures, etc.?

_____ Yes
_____ No

If yes, indicate the teaching aid(s) used _____

6. Did you and children discuss the following?

	Yes	No
a. Writing a diary		
b. Exhibits of photos		
c. Setting up a bulletin board		
d. Articles in class or school newspaper		
e. Writing of thank you letters		
f. Others		

Describe: _____

_____

7. Describe the main ideas about the site that you and the children discussed (most important first, next most important second, etc.)

1. _____

_____

2. _____

_____

3. _____

_____

Center for Urban Education
Educational Field Trips in Nonpublic Schools

CHILDREN'S QUESTIONNAIRE ON RETENTION

Child's Name: _____

Teacher's Name: _____ Class: _____

1. Would you like to go to _____ again?
Name of site visited

_____ Yes
_____ No
Why? _____

2. Did you talk about the trip with anyone at home?

_____ Yes
_____ No

3. What do you remember most about the trip? _____
_____

What else do you remember? _____
_____

4. Have you gone back and visited _____ since you took the trip several weeks ago?
Name of site visited

_____ Yes
_____ No

(If answer is yes) With whom did you go? _____

5. Would you like to go on more of these trips to other places?

_____ Yes
_____ No

Where? _____

APPENDIX C

STAFF LIST

Thomas G. Vinci, Evaluation Director
Assistant Professor of Education
School of Education
Fordham University

Christine DeVita, Interviewer
Fordham University

Cynthia G. Kruger, Interviewer
Fordham University

Joanne T. Mango, Interviewer
Fordham University

Laura Merit, Interviewer

John Paolella, Statistical Clerk